

Application No. 10/091,651
Attorney Docket No. 75851-313560

Remarks

Claims 1-8, 12-17 and 20-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) in view of Hirni et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,731,609). Further, claims 9-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in light of the combination of Hirni and Atsman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,607,136). Claims 1-23 were pending. Claims 1 and 5 have been canceled without prejudice; claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 12 have been amended; and claims 24-25 have been added. Hence, claims 2-4 and 6-25 remain pending. Applicant respectfully amends in part and traverses in part to overcome the rejections.

As amended, claim 12 provides a method for controlling a network of conversation control systems. The method includes, *inter alia*, "receiving an indication of a preformed script item to respond to the information received from the recipient". As the term script denotes, script items are preformed content including, but not limited to, a salutation, a question, or a response that can be used to control (i.e., script) the presentation of a communication or conversation. Application at p. 6, paragraph 37. By having a user of a conversation control system select a script item, rather than simply verbally responding, an approach carried out by the user will more likely to conform to desired standards.

In stark contrast, Hirni does not disclose, teach or suggest selection from preformed script items. Rather, Hirni merely discloses a telephonic system that is capable of facilitating communications across a packet based network. Hirni at abstract, col. 1, ll. 59-64. Thus, Hirni discloses what has become commonly referred to as a Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) system. Such systems, like the standard telephone systems that have existed for over one hundred years, provide a facility that allows users to freely communicate one with another, and without interference with the content of such communication. Such systems do not provide preformed script items that control the content of an ongoing communication. Hence, Hirni does not anticipate applicants claim 12, and applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 12. It should be noted that Astman et al. also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations.

Also, claims 13-23 properly depend upon an allowable independent claim, and are thus allowable for at least this reason. Hence, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections thereof and allowance of the aforementioned claims. Added claims 24 and 25 include

Application No. 10/091,651
Attorney Docket No. 75851-313560

a similar limitation to that discussed above, and for at least that reason are also in condition for allowance. Claims 2-4 and 6-11 properly depend from allowable independent claims, and are thus allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed to be due for this response. However, please charge any required fees or credit any overpayments for this Amendment to Deposit Account 06-0029.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of this case in any way, please call the undersigned at 303-607-3500.

Dated: 1/25/05

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. Hamilton
Reg. No. 47,629

Customer No. 35657
FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
2200 Wells Fargo Center
90 South 7th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: (303) 607-3500
Fax: (303) 607-3600

DNVRI 60289046 01